



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/520,728      | 01/09/2005  | Casimir Johan Crawley | PU020286            | 9711             |

7590 01/03/2011  
Joseph S Tripoli  
Thomson Licensing Inc  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HU, RUI MENG

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2618

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

01/03/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                        |                        |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>    |  |
|                              | 10/520,728             | CRAWLEY, CASIMIR JOHAN |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>        |  |
|                              | RuiMeng Hu             | 2618                   |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) and a submission, filed on 04/14/2010.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/14/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the newly added limitation in **claim 1** "wherein said polling includes requesting information regarding the lock condition from the decoder", Applicant argued that The Examiner's assertion is false, reference to FIG. 3 clearly depicts the processor 34 and the EFM decoder 32 having two-way communication over an I2C bus. The processor 34 has direct control over the decoder 32, as is further shown by the present specification on page 4, lines 24-26. Thus, it is entirely reasonable for the processor 34 to actively query the decoder 32 to detect a loss of a lock condition.

The Examiner respectfully submits that Figure 3 and page 4, lines 24-26 mentioned detecting a signal loss in decoder 32 and resetting and initialization of the decoder 32 when a loss of the signal is detected, as two-way communication over I2C bus. The specification fails to show the claimed subject matter that processor 34 sending a request to decoder 32 for information regarding the lock condition of the decoder 32; therefore, the newly added limitation is not supported by the specification.

Regarding **claims 1 and 7**, Applicant argued that the applied references (Zuqert et al. (US 6466832) and Sakamoto (US Patent 4940951) fail to disclose actively

Art Unit: 2618

"polling", the plain meaning of "polling" must be considered as defined by <http://www.webopedia.com> (2) making continuous requests for data from another device, for example modems that support polling can call another system and request data. The Examiner respectfully submits that claim 1 recites "a processor for polling the decoder for detecting a loss of phase lock condition", however the specification provides no detail of the polling means, the definition of "polling" above clearly stated requests for data from another device, however the specification fails to mention the processor sends any request data. Further, only one device is present in current application, in which the decoder and the processor are parts of the wireless device, and specifically the decoder only decodes, it lacks a function of receiving and responding to a request data. Thus the "polling" means of current application is clearly not the case nor in the field of the above defined statement, therefore the definition of "for polling" comprises "for detecting" based on the above analysis, "polling" can be plainly interpreted as receiving samples and testing/analyzing the received samples to generate a result, Sakamoto's PLL clearly takes actions as to receive data samples and analyze the samples for detecting a phase unlock state.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1-6 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding the newly added limitation in **claim 1** “wherein said polling includes requesting information regarding the lock condition from the decoder”, Applicant argued that reference to FIG. 3 clearly depicts the processor 34 and the EFM decoder 32 having two-way communication over an I2C bus. The processor 34 has direct control over the decoder 32, as is further shown by the present specification on page 4, lines 24-26. Thus, it is entirely reasonable for the processor 34 to actively query the decoder 32 to detect a loss of a lock condition.

The Examiner respectfully submits that Figure 3 and page 4, lines 24-26 mentioned that detecting a signal loss in decoder 32 and resetting and initialization of the decoder 32 when a loss of the signal is detected, as two-way communication over I2C bus. The specification fails to show the claimed subject matter that processor 34 sending a request to decoder 32 for information regarding the lock condition of the decoder 32; therefore, the newly added limitation is not supported by the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2618

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. **Claims 1-3 and 5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zuqert et al. (US 6466832)** in view of **Sakamoto (US Patent 4940951)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Zuqert et al. disclose an apparatus, comprising: a radio frequency control configured for entering a user-desired channel frequency selected from a plurality of pre-defined frequency values (column 20 lines 1-11, via user interface the user initiated switching to a different channel, to establish a better quality channel, and such better quality channel is considered to be a user-desired channel); a reception circuit including a frequency synthesizer (figure 7, a receiver 24, frequency synthesizer 326) configured for receiving an incoming wireless audio file signal from a computer (column 10 lines 9-12); a decoder (DSP 270) for digitally demodulating an audio file signal (abstract) from said reception circuit; and a processor (DSP 270, figure 8, column 17 line 53-column 20 line 11, consider switching from frequency f1 to f2, the DSP is re-initialized for processing received signal on channel f2 (the new channel)) for re-initializing said decoder in response to a loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of

Art Unit: 2618

said audio file signal and setting said frequency synthesizer (frequency synthesizer 326) at one of a plurality of pre-defined frequency values to re-establish said phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal (re-establishing signal processing as switched to the new frequency) and sending the audio file to an audio system (figure 7, an audio system 44).

However Zuqert et al. fail to disclose a processor for polling the decoder for detecting a loss of phase lock condition in the demodulation of the audio file signal and re-initializing said decoder in response to the loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal.

In the same field of endeavor, Sakamoto disclose a receiver (figures 1 and 4, PLL 16, column 3 line 58-column 4 line 10, column 7 lines 18-61) for receiving an RF signal; a decoder (figure 4, QPSK demodulator 14 and PCM decoder 20) for demodulating said signal; and a processor (figure 4, column 3 lines 65-68, a detection circuit and the PLL circuit) configured to poll (continuously detecting for an unlocked state) said decoder for a loss of a phase lock loop in said demodulating of said signal to detect audio file signal loss between the receiver and a transmitter (an unlocked state to be detected when the signal loss in transmission) and re-initializing said decoder in response to the loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal (re-initializing phase lock of said QPSK demodulator 14) (Note: PCM is the standard form for digital audio).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the selection techniques taught by

Art Unit: 2618

Sakamoto into the art of Zuger et al. as to include PLL 16 of figure 1 or 4 for improving QPSK demodulation.

Consider **claim 2 as applied to claim 1**, Zuger et al. as modified disclose wherein said plurality of frequencies comprises 900MHz range channel frequencies (Zuger et al. column 16 lines 58-62).

Consider **claim 3 as applied to claim 2**, Zuger et al. as modified disclose wherein said plurality of frequencies comprises 905 MHz, 911 MHz, 917 MHz and 923 MHz (Zuger et al. column 16 lines 58-62).

Consider **claim 5 as applied to claim 1**, Zuger et al. as modified fail to disclose wherein said demodulating said audio file signal provides a digital audio stream conforming to an I2S audio format.

However, official notice is taken that I2S is used for digital electronic devices (as a CD player) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use I2S interface to correspond the existing digital audio stream, and output stereo.

Consider **claim 6 as applied to claim 1**, Zuger et al. as modified disclose wherein said processor is a microprocessor (Zuger et al. figure 7, DSP 270).

Consider **claim 7**, Zuger et al. disclose a computer readable storage device having software instructions recorded thereon that, (column 16 lines 33-45, the processor containing software instructions adaptively controls operation of the receiver), when executed by a processor, performs the steps of: receiving a modulated audio file signal from a computer (figure 7, Abstract, column 10 lines 9-12); demodulating said



Art Unit: 2618

audio file signal to a digital audio stream (figure 7, down-converters 38, base-band processors 40); polling for detecting a loss of phase lock condition in the demodulation of the audio file signal” (the deployment of the current channel) is known/detected to the processor of the receiver; re-initializing said demodulating in response to a loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal (DSP 270, figure 8, column 17 line 53-column 20 line 11, consider switching from frequency f1 to f2, the DSP is initialized for processing received signal on channel f2 (the new channel)); and setting said receiving of the modulated audio file signal at one of a plurality of channel frequencies to re-establish said phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal (re-establishing signal processing as switched to the new frequency); and sending the audio file signal to an audio system (figure 7, an audio system 44).

However Zuerger et al. fail to disclose detecting a loss of phase lock condition in the demodulation of the audio file signal; re-initializing said demodulating in response to the loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal.

In the same field of endeavor, Sakamoto disclose a receiver (figures 1 and 4, PLL 16, column 3 line 58-column 4 line 10, column 7 lines 18-61) for receiving an RF signal; a decoder (figure 4, QPSK demodulator 14 and PCM decoder 20) for demodulating said signal; and a processor (figure 4, column 3 lines 65-68, a detection circuit and the PLL circuit) configured to poll (continuously detecting for an unlocked state) said decoder for a loss of a phase lock loop in said demodulating of said signal to detect audio file signal loss between the receiver and a transmitter (an unlocked state to be detected when the signal loss in transmission) and re-initializing said demodulating

Art Unit: 2618

in response to the loss of a phase lock in said demodulating of said audio file signal (re-initializing phase lock of said QPSK demodulator 14) (Note: PCM is the standard form for digital audio).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the selection techniques taught by Sakamoto into the art of Zuger et al. as to include PLL 16 of figure 1 or 4 for improving QPSK demodulation.

**Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zuger et al. (US 6466832)** as modified by **Sakamoto (US Patent 4940951)** in view of **Bowles (US Patent 6389548)**.

Consider **claim 4 as applied to claim 1**, Zuger et al. as modified fail to disclose wherein said decoder comprises an eight-to-fourteen modulation EFM digital decoder. This teaching is extremely well known in the art as disclosed by Bowles (US Patent 6389548), figure 3, EFM decoder 38. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an EFM digital decoder to output CD audio.

**Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zuger et al. (US 6466832)** as modified by **Sakamoto (US Patent 4940951)** in view of **Bowles (US Patent 6389548)**.

Consider **claim 8 as applied to claim 7**, Zuger et al. as modified fail to disclose wherein said demodulating comprises a digital eight-to-fourteen modulation EFM digital decoding of said audio file signal. This teaching is well known in the art as disclosed by

Art Unit: 2618

Bowles (US Patent 6389548), figure 3, EFM decoder 38. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an EFM digital decoder to output CD audio.

**Claim 26** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zuqert et al. (US 6466832)** as modified by **Sakamoto (US Patent 4940951)** in view of **Champion (US Pub. 2002/0072817)**.

Consider **claim 26 as applied to claim 1**, Zuqert et al. as modified fail to disclose a radio frequency remote control configured for entering a user-desired channel frequency selected from a plurality of pre-defined frequency values.

In the same field of endeavor, Champion discloses a wireless audio system comprising a radio frequency remote control configured for entering a user-desired channel frequency selected from a plurality of pre-defined frequency values (paragraphs 39 and 55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the selection techniques taught by Champion into the art of Zuqert et al. as modified as to permit the user to initially select a user-desired channel.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed**

**to:** Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2618

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RuiMeng Hu whose telephone number is 571-270-1105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/RuiMeng Hu/  
R.H./rh  
June 14, 2010

/Edward Urban/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618